

**PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
MINUTES OF REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING OF
JUNE 4, 1998
IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS - 12TH FLOOR
CITY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING**

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steele at 9:05 a.m. Chairperson Steele adjourned the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

Chairperson Mark Steele-present
Vice-Chairperson William Anderson-not present
Commissioner Patricia Butler-present
Commissioner Verna Quinn-not present
Commissioner Andrea Skorepa-present
Commissioner David Watson-present
Commissioner Frisco White-present
Betsy McCullough, Community Planning & Development Manager-present
Rick Duvernay, Deputy City Attorney-present
Gary Halbert, Deputy Director, DSD-present
Rob Hawk, Deputy City Engineer, DSD-present
Linda Lugano, Recorder-present

ITEM-1: ANNOUNCEMENTS/PUBLIC COMMENT - ISSUES WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMISSION NOT PREVIOUSLY HEARD.

None.

ITEM-2: REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE FOR MORNING AGENDA ITEMS.

Bob Korch, Project Manager requested that Item No. 11 South Palm Vista Extension of Time be continued as the applicant and staff would like additional time to review issues.

ITEM-3: REQUESTS FOR ITEMS TO BE PLACED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

Commissioners requested that Items No. 9, 10 and 12 be placed on the consent agenda.

ITEM-4: DIRECTOR'S REPORT.

Kurt Chilcott, outgoing Director of Community & Economic Development thanked the Commissioners for all their work and dedication to the City. Tina Christiansen, Director of Development Services advised the Commissioners that she will be interim director of C&ED until a new director is appointed and that Stephen Haase, Assistant Director of Development Services will be interim Director of DSD.

ITEM-5: COMMISSION COMMENT.

Chairperson Steele updated the Commission on the Strategic Plan. The Steering Committee is continuing to work with the Mayor on the formations of the committees and the recruitment of chair people for these committees. This should be complete in approximately two weeks.

A workshop has been scheduled for July 23, 1998 for the Planning Commission to discuss a working vision for the Strategic Plan. And, a workshop on August 13, 1998 at Planning Commission to discuss the affordable housing issue. Commissioner Skorepa requested that staff be sure to invite other agencies and organizations that are involved in housing issues to this workshop.

Staff also has been working on establishing a web site data base and have been working with Nick Dilozenzo who has a sophisticated computer program for developing and recording planning projects.

Commissioner Butler inquired as to the field trips that recently have been scheduled and requested that the Commission be asked if they feel there is a need for these trips and if so, what the issues might be, and how they can be logistically handled.

ITEM-6: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 30, 1998, MAY 7, 1998 AND MAY 14, 1998.

COMMISSION ACTION:

MOTION BY BUTLER TO APPROVE THESE MINUTES. Second by White. Passed by a 5-0 vote with Vice-Chairperson Anderson and Commission Quinn not present.

ITEM-7: INITIATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN AND THE CARMEL MOUNTAIN RANCH COMMUNITY PLAN, TO REDESIGNATE A 2.63 ACRE SITE FROM SA680 RIGHT-OF-WAY TO NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL, CPA, RZ, PCD, CUP 98-0252.

Bob Manis presented Report to the Planning Commission No. P-98-084.

Testimony in favor by:

Rebecca Michaels, representing DDN Income Properties. Advised that DDN owns this subject property, not the other three, and they are asking for this initiation. There are three criteria that allows the Commission to initiate a plan amendment and this one meets the third criteria. That fact that the county deleted SA-680 is a material change and for a project to move forward, a plan amendment needs to be initiated.

Testimony in opposition by:

Richard Belzer, Chairperson of the Rancho Bernardo Planning Board. In opposition to this project and to the amendment of the Progress Guide and General Plan and the Carmel Mt. Community Plan. Don't feel the request is appropriate due to the material change in circumstances. The property is no longer needed for roadway improvements with the elimination of SA 680, but does not mean it should be developed as a retail site.

Public testimony was closed.

COMMISSION ACTION:

MOTION BY WATSON TO APPROVE THE INITIATION. STAFF WAS INSTRUCTED TO LOOK AT APPROPRIATE LAND USE DESIGNS FOR THE OTHER THREE CORNERS AS WELL. Second by Skorepa. Passed by a 5-0 vote with Vice-Chairperson Anderson and Commissioner Quinn not present.

ITEM-8: **BARRIO LOGAN REDEVELOPMENT EXPANSION SURVEY AREA.**
This item was pulled from the docket indefinitely.

ITEM-9: **NANCY RIDGE TECHNOLOGY CENTER, TENTATIVE MAP AND PLANNED INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT NO. 96-7822 FOR THE SUBDIVISION OF ONE LOT INTO FIVE PARCELS.**

COMMISSION ACTION:

CONSENT MOTION BY BUTLER TO APPROVE THE TM AND PID NO. 96-7822. Second by Watson. Passed by a 5-0 vote with Chairperson Anderson and Commission Quinn not present.

ITEM-10: **VILLAS DE DERBY DOWNS - CARMEL VALLEY PLANNED DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT PLAN/RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE PERMIT AND TENTATIVE MAP NO. 96-7778.**

COMMISSION ACTION:

CONSENT MOTION BY BUTLER TO APPROVE THE PERMIT AND TENTATIVE MAP SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN ATTACHMENTS NOS. 5 AND 6. Second by Watson. Passed by a 5-0 vote with Chairperson Anderson and Commission Quinn not present.

- ITEM-11: **EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SOUTH PALM VISTA VESTING TENTATIVE MAP, REZONE, PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE PERMITS NO. 98-0270.**

COMMISSION ACTION:

MOTION BY WHITE TO CONTINUE TO JULY 9, 1998 FOR THE APPLICANT AND STAFF TO HAVE ADDITIONAL TIME TO REVIEW ISSUES. Second by Watson. Passed by a 5-0 vote with Vice-Chairperson Anderson and Commissioner Quinn not present.

- ITEM-12: **PALOMAR AVENUE TENTATIVE MAP AND COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT WITH VARIANCE NO 96-7702.**

COMMISSION ACTION:

CONSENT MOTION BY BUTLER TO APPROVE THE TM AND COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 96-7702 SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS IN ATTACHMENTS 4 AND 5. Second by Watson. Passed by a 5-0 vote with Chairperson Anderson and Commission Quinn not present.

- ITEM-13: **STATE ROUTE 56 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND APPROVAL OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (CDP 96-7285) FOR THAT PORTION OF THE PROJECT WITHIN THE COASTAL ZONE.**

Frank Belock and Gretchen Softley presented Report to the Planning Commission No. P-98-098.

Testimony in favor by:

Sherry Barrett, U.S. Fish & Wildlife. The Fish & Wildlife service recognizes the need and importance of SR 56 and they support any of the northern alignments described in the EIR with mitigation.

Bill Tippets, California Department Fish & Game. The department has a long history of working with the City Planning Department and private owners in developing the MSCP subarea plan. The MSCP is the largest approved regional conservation plan in California. Critical to their approval of this plan was the preservation of high value habitat on Del Mar Mesa and adjacent area. An essential part of the preservation included that the substantial connectivity will remain in tact. And, they have serious concerns regarding the central alignment.

Scott Harvey, San Diegans for Responsible Freeway Planning. They want SR-56 built. The question is which alignment. Environmentally impacts are very similar on all alignments. Doesn't it make sense to select an alignment that has the least disruption to people currently here. Select the central alignment as it has less impact.

Deborah Jones, citizen. Growth is inevitable, but what is essential is that we leave behind good habitat for humans, and viable connected habitat for species. The central alignment fragments pristine habitat by dissecting it. She is in favor of Northern alignments D or F.

Mike Kelly, Friends of Penasquitos Canyon. Urge recommendation of alignment F as it avoids the impacts to Deer Canyon, makes future of Pacific Highlands Ranch work better as a community center. And, it provides a hard edged buffer before future development in Subarea III.

Cindy Burrascano, California Native Plant Society. Spoke to the level of impact on each plant species and how each is affected in consideration of the alignment. Fragmentation is a real issue as well as it drastically changes the hydrology of each area.

Ann Harvey, Carmel Valley Planning Board. The Board was faced with a choice to recommend approval of a central alignment which would gut the MSCP preserve or approve a northern alignment which would gut a brand new small town before it was even built. That's why they requested to see a modified northern alignment.

Alex Landon, Santa Fe Sur Homeowners Association. Staff has advised that the northern freeway alignments would only affect those people living in Carmel Valley, Rancho Penasquitos and Ranch Glens. This information is not exactly correct. Current residents impacted by the proposed F and D alignments include hundreds of people living in the farms, Del Mar County Club and other places.

Beatrice Beck, owner. Her property is right in the middle of Subarea III. She is very definitely opposed to alignment D as it would totally destroy her home. The other two northern alignments are not good, but she could put up with the noise.

Mike Madigan, Pardee. Pardee originally supported the central alignment however it was opposed to the community and environmental groups and federal agencies because of impacts on the MSCP. Pardee has been involved with negotiations with a broad base of community leaders about the future of Subarea III and 8A. They have become convinced the alignment F will best meet the needs of the preserve and the community.

Christopher Barczewski, Barczewski Family Trust and Rancho Del Sol. Any SR-56 alignment will cross their property. They understand the need for this road, but they have a preferred and modified central alignment as it lessens negative impacts.

David Goodell, Subarea IV property owners. This road has to be environmentally acceptable and both the central and northern alignments have to result in viable communities. Feels he should have lobbied more to point out to all the people here today to let them know that a lot of attention has been on Subarea III and not Subarea IV. He too supports Alignment F in Subarea III, but the only viable alternative in Subarea IV is the northern alignment.

Debbie Collins, Lettieri McIntyre & Associates. First, they concur that the City should pursue all possible efforts with the resource agencies to come up with design alternatives for the central alignment, second they are opposed to D alignment and concur with the Commission's previous comments.

Keith Rhodes, representing himself. Owns property in the southeast quadrant and he supports the modified alignment F in Subarea III and Subarea IV.

Lisa Ross, Carmel Valley Planning Board. The Board has had several concerns with the D alignment from a planning perspective, particularly in regards to community character and noise impacts. First of which is the effect on Seabreeze Farms.

Walter Heiberg, McMillin Communities. They are in favor of the central alignment or northern alignment as has been shown in the community plan. If this is not possible they are in favor of the northern alignment as it has had all its environmental review.

Leigh Crueger, Rancho Glens Estates. Spoke to an analysis of signed responses to draft the EIR included in the final environmental impact report and the November 15, 1997 notice of preparation. A total of 285 responses favored the central alignment or 84%.

Bob Wendt, resident. Stated he is very concerned over the effects SR-56 will have on the present traffic conditions in the I-5 corridor especially where I-5 and 805 merge.

Chad Harris, Western Pacific Housing. Spoke to the potential lack of access issue for the southwest portion of Subarea IV. He was told by staff that the original northern alignment was the best solution to this, and the question is, is that acceptable.

Testimony in opposition:

Opal Trueblood, President Torrey Pines Association. Since the TP State Preserve is part of the ecological system, they feel it is important to take a position to request the Commissioners to favor Alignment D, the modified northern D alignment because it is the least dangerous alternative in terms of the ecology.

Suzanne Lichter, resident. There is no doubt that this highway is needed and we should be reviewing why. To permit further development of Carmel Valley and to relieve the traffic congestion on I-15. She does not believe an 8 lane expressway through a beautiful suburban residential area is the correct solution.

Susan Paterson, resident. She hopes that the Commissioners do not turn a blind eye to the findings of the EIR by considering environmentally unsafe central route. She supports alignment F.

Mark Tamsen, representing the health of San Diegans. Spoke to the Commission as a medical doctor. Any comments made today do not address human biology. Only two physicians have responded to the EIR. Recommend the central alignment only or nothing for the reasons that 200 tons of extra pollution will be produced by any of the northern alignments. Fifty to 200 people will be killed with any of the northern alignments.

Melanie Maxon, representing herself. She favors the F alignment and considers the four lane highway instead of the proposed six lanes.

Michael Beck, representing Endangered Habitats League. First point of conservation focused on the implication of a breakdown between the City and the wildlife agencies on this issue. The central alignment should not be built because it is an unmitigable impact. It is a reserve design issue, quality issue, not simply a quantity issue. Really a reserve design issue in an area where we have no flexibility left. Urged support for the modified F and not move forward with the central alignment.

Public testimony was closed.

COMMISSION ACTION:

MOTION BY WATSON TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THEY ADOPT ALTERNATIVE 'F' THROUGH SUBAREA III AND THE NORTHERN ALIGNMENT THROUGH SUBAREA IV BECAUSE THEY MATCH UP PERFECTLY AT THE BORDER LINE, AND BASED ON THE STAFF COMMENTS, THE CORRECT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND THE ENGINEERING HAS BEEN DONE. AND RECOMMEND THAT THE COUNCIL APPROVES THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT. Second by Skorepa. Passed by a 4-0 vote with Commissioner White abstaining and Vice-Chairperson Anderson and Commissioner Quinn not present.

ITEM-14: **SABRE SPRINGS COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT. AMENDMENT TO THE PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN AND THE SABRE SPRINGS COMMUNITY PLAN TO**

REDESIGNATE AND REZONE VARIOUS PARCELS LOCATED THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY. CPA PROJECT NO. 35-0419 AND A PRD VESTING TM 96-7647 TO REPLACE A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED MULTIPLE FAMILY PROJECT WITH 72 SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS RANGING IN SIZE BETWEEN 2520-3432 SQUARE FEET ON PARCELS ZONED R1-5000 AND CONTAINING A MINIMUM OF 5,000 SQUARE FEET FOR PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN PARCEL 11 OF SABRE SPRINGS COMMUNITY PLAN.

Bob Manis presented Report to the Planning Commission No. P98-079.

Testimony in favor by:

Steve Silverman, representing Pardee Homes. Spoke to the issue of the number of density units. Policy issue has one of the major effects as to what has happened in Sabre Springs. When the community plan was originally approved with 5200 units. As development happened, the standard policy was that you could always produce production fewer units in the community plan, never more. When it came time to review the community plan, the number of units were changed. Every time a new development approved, there were fewer dwelling units. In one action by ruling on this community plan amendment it is not going to solve the regional housing problems.

Mike Madigan, representing Pardee. Expressed he would like to have this community plan amendment approved because it is the result of a considerable amount of work on a plan to designate projects which they believe their current zoning gives them the right to build. They have agreed to go through this plan amendment process. Sabre Springs has been their hope over the years to build this area and they have been losing money on it because of the policies of this city.

Public testimony was closed.

COMMISSION ACTION:

MOTION BY WHITE TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THEY APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AND TO SPECIFY TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THE CITY HAS REGIONAL PROBLEMS ON RESIDENTIAL AND INDUSTRIAL LAND AND ARE OPERATING WITHOUT A POLICY AND WITHOUT DIRECTION. Second by Steele. Failed by a vote of 3-2 with Butler, Watson and Skorepa voting nay.

MOTION BY BUTLER TO CONTINUE TO JUNE 25, 1998 WITH A SPECIFIC REQUEST THAT STAFF BRING BACK AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONTEXT OF THIS REDUCTION IN DENSITY IN SANDAG'S FIGURES AND HAVE THEM PRESENT IT TO THIS COMMISSION IN TERMS OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO'S AND THE REGION'S NEEDS FOR HOUSING OVER THE NEXT DECADE. Second by Skorepa. Passed by a 4-1 vote with Commission White voting nay.

ITEM-15: **TORREY RESERVE GATEWAY; SORRENTO HILLS COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT AND AMENDMENT TO THE PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN, AND REZONE, PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND VESTING TENTATIVE MAP, NO 96-0464, AMENDMENT TO HILLSIDE REVIEW PERMIT NO. 83-0167.**

Tracy Elliot-Yawn presented Report to the Planning Commission No. P-98-100.

Testimony in favor by:

Robert Pinnegar, San Diego County Apartment Association. In support of additional multi-family housing in general, in broad support. Availability of multi-family for rental is lower than it has been in many years and as a result of that they are being forced to get involved in issues they have not traditionally been involved in.

Matt Peterson, representing Harry Cooper. Advised that in 1983 the community plan and TM were approved for this site. At that time, his client's site was proposed for industrial. His client has diligently pursued marketing his site for industrial use since then. To date, he has been unsuccessful. As a direct consequence of the amendments that took place in 1994 and 1997, the site is no longer viable for an industrial user. Because of his failed efforts, his client initiated a community plan amendment in February of 1996 to amend the land use designation from industrial to single family residential.

Doug Boyd, T&B Planning Consultants. Discussed SANDAG's figures regarding square footage requirements per employee; employees generated by land use; industrial type uses and neighborhood commercial uses, generation of housing needs, analysis of employees to housing

balance in Sorrento Hills. Discussed what the balance was of residential product to serve this employment base. Want people to be able to live where they work and not get on the freeway to go to where they work.

Harry Cooper, owner. Explained that he has owned this land since 1976 and explained the history of this property since then. Explained what the zoning was and how it has changed during the years. He claimed that he came to the staff and asked what he should do with all these changes. They supported coming to the Commission and got direction to convert it to single family homes.

Testimony in opposition by:

Opal Trueblood, representing the Torrey Pines Association. They have grave concerns over the Torrey Reserve Gateway. Pointed out that the County's estimate of the housing that will be needed in the future is based on growth in the past and projections of what will happen in the future. But unless there is the industrial base to support the jobs, there aren't going to be that many people living here.

Ann Harvey, Carmel Valley Community Planning Group. The problem is that it is too late to be swapping this property over to residential property. You are not being shown the complete picture. In Carmel Valley we asked to show Sorrento Hills; now you're being shown Sorrento Hills without Carmel Valley. Carmel Valley is basically a bedroom community full of all kinds of housing. To claim that Sorrento Hills now needs to be balanced out with residential doesn't make sense because it will throw Carmel Valley the other way.

Public testimony was closed.

COMMISSION ACTION:

MOTION BY WHITE TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ACCEPT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION AND DENY THE COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT. Motion withdrawn.

MOTION BY WATSON TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT THE ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION IN THE STAFF REPORT AND APPROVE THE COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT. Second by White. Passed by a 5-0 vote with Vice-Chairperson Anderson and Commissioner Quinn not present.

**ITEM-16: IMPLEMENTATION OF HOUSING ELEMENT REGULATORY
CHANGES FOR EMERGENCY SHELTERS AND TRANSITIONAL
HOUSING.**

Continued to June 11, 1998.

ITEM-17: GRANT HILL FIELD TRIP - CANCELED

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Steele at 2:10 p.m.
